

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8239.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Jagson Pal and Company, Main Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 82 of 1979

between

SHRI VED PARKASH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JAGSON PAL AND COMPANY, MAIN MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the Workman.

Shri Mahipal Singh, Assistant Factory Manager, for the Management.

AWARD

This reference No. 82 of 1979 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, — vide his order No. ID/58233, dated 27th December, 1979 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ved Parkash workman and the management of M/s Jagson Pal and Company, Main Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ved Parkash was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this court through their authorised representatives. The management has filed a written statement on 7th February, 1980. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 20th February, 1980.

1. Whether the domestic enquiry conducted by the management was proper and fair and according to the principles natural justice ?
2. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
3. Relief.

On 12th June, 1980 Shri Mahipal Singh, Assistant Factory Manager for the respondent management made a statement that the workman has resigned from the service of the respondent Company and he has duly received a sum of Rs 7,000 (Seven Thousand only) in full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipt to this effect and the copy of the documents are Ex. M1 to M9 which were placed on the file.

The above said facts was admitted by the representative of the workman in this court on that day and he signed his statement agreeing to the above statement. He further stated that now there is no dispute left with the respondent management.

In view of the above statement of both the parties, I give my award accordingly and hold that there is no dispute left between the parties. No order as to costs. So this award is in answer of this reference.

Dated 12th June, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 984, dated 20th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8240.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 178 of 1980

between

SHRI ADARSH KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BRAKE LINING LIMITED, 66 A, NIT, FARIDABAD

Present.—

None, for the workman.

Shri A. S. Chadha and Shri Rajesh Sharma, for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 178 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/33-80/13652, dated 14th March, 1980 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Adarsh Kumar, workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Adarsh Kumar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980 the case was called at 8.30 a.m. but none was present on behalf of the workman and I kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called again at 9.30 a.m. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed *ex parte* against the workman and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980 the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khattar, Time office incharge of the respondent Company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman had tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Ex. M-1. He further stated that the workman had duly taken or received full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipts voucher of this amount which is Ex. M-2 which were placed on the file.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management. I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absenting of the workman in the proceedings in this Court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent management, and its held that the reference is bad, as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 17th June, 1980.

Endorsement No. 999, dated 20th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab/8241.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY PRESIDING OFFICER LABOUR COURT
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 177 of 1980

between

SHRI KAWAL NAIN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BRAKE LINING,
LIMITED, 66-A, NIT, FARIDABAD

Present .—

None for the workman.

Shri A. S. Chadha and Shri Rajesh Sharma for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 177 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/33-80/13658, dated 14th March, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Kawal Singh, workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Kawal Nain was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled.

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980 the case was called at 8.30 A.M. but none was present on behalf of the workman and I kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called again at 9.30 A.M. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed ex parte agaist the workman and the case was fixed for the ex parte evidence of the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980 the ex parte evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khattar, Time Office Incharge of the respondent Company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman had tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Ex. M-1. He further stated that the workman has duly taken or received full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipts voucher of this amount which is Ex. M-2 which were placed on the file.

In view of the un-rebutted ex parte evidence produced by the management. I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding get support from the absenct of the workmen in the proceedings in this Court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent management and it is held that the reference is bad, as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference,

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 17th July, 1980.

Endstt. No. 998, dated the 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8242.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (As No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/S Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 175 of 1980

Between

SHRI JASWANT SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BRAKE LINING
LIMITED, 66-A, NIT, FARIDABAD.

Present.—

None for the workman.

Shri A. S. Chadha, and Shri Rajesh Sharma, for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 175 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/RD/33-80/13670, dated 14th March, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Jaswant Singh, workman and the management of M/S. Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Jaswant Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980 the case was called at 8.30 a.m. but none was present on behalf of the workman and I kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called again at 9.30 a.m. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed *ex parte* against the workman and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980, the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khattar, Time Office Incharge of the respondent Company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman had tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Exhibit M-1. He further stated that the workman had duly taken or received full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipts voucher of this amount which is Exhibit M-2 which was placed on the file.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absenting of the workman in the proceedings in this Court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent management and it is held that the reference is bad, as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

Dated 17th June, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 997, dated 20th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act,

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8243.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/S Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No 174 of 1980

between

SHRI ONKAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BRAKE LINING
LIMITED, 66-A, N.I.T., FARIDABAD

Present.—

None for the Workman.

Shri A. S. Chadha, and Shri Rajesh Sharma, for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference No. 174 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/33-80/13696, dated 14th March, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Onkar Singh, workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

“Whether the termination of Shri Onkar Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980, the case was called at 8.30 a.m. but none was present on behalf of the workman and kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called again at 9.30 a.m. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed *ex parte* against the workman and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980 the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khattar, Time Office Incharge of the respondent Company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman had tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Exhibit M-1. He further stated that the workman had duly taken or received full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipts voucher of this amount, which is Exhibit M-2 which was placed on the file.

In view of the unrebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absenting of the workman in the proceedings in this Court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent management and it is held that the reference is bad, as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Dated the 17th June, 1980.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 996, dated the 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8244.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 173 of 1980

between

SHRI LALA RAM WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BRAKE LINING LIMITED,
66-A, NIT, FARIDABAD

Present :

None for the workman.

Shri A. S. Chadha and Shri Rajesh Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 173 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/33-80/13688, dated 14th March, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Lala Ram workman and the management of M/s. Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, N. I.T., Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Lala Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980 the case was called at 8.30 a. m. but none was present on behalf of the workman and I kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called against at 9.30 a. m. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed ex-parte against the workman and the case was fixed for the ex parte evidence the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980 the ex-parte evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khatter, Time Office Incharge of the respondent Company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman had tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Ex. M-1. He further stated that the workman had duly taken or received full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipts voucher of this amount which is Ex. M-2 which was placed on the file.

In view of the unrefuted ex-parte evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absenting of the workman in the proceedings in this court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent management and it is held that the reference is bad as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Dated the 16th June, 1980.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endstt. No. 995, dated the 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11 (112)-80.3Lab/8245.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act. No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Unik Springs India Ltd., 38-A, Industrial Area, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 187 of 1980

between

SHRI RAJ DEO WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S UNIK SPRINGS
INDIA LTD., 38-A, INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri Adrash Kishore Sharma, for the workman.

Shri Satish Ahuja, for the management.